

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

\* \* \*

MARGARET CORNIOLA,

Plaintiff,

v.

PERMOBIL, INC., *et al.*,

Defendant.

Case No. 2:18-cv-01081-JCM-GWF

**ORDER**

This matter is before the Court on the parties' Stipulated Discovery Plan and Scheduling Order (ECF No. 19), filed August 2, 2018.

LR 26-1(e)(1) provides that unless otherwise ordered, discovery periods longer than one hundred eighty (180) days from the date the first defendant answers or appears will require special scheduling review. Where such special scheduling review is requested, the plan shall state the reasons why longer or different time periods should apply. The parties' proposed discovery plan does not set forth the reasons for a discovery period in excess of 180 days. In addition, LR 26-1(d) requires parties seeking special scheduling review for longer or different discovery time periods to state "SPECIAL SCHEDULING REVIEW REQUESTED" on the face of the pleading and in bold type. Accordingly,

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that parties' Stipulated Discovery Plan and Scheduling Order (ECF No. 19) is **denied**, without prejudice.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the parties are to file a revised Discovery Plan and Scheduling Order in compliance with LR 26-1(d),

...

...

1 including a statement of the reasons for which an extended discovery period is warranted in this  
2 case, within **seven (7) days** of the date of this order.

3 Dated this 7th day of August, 2018.

4 

5 \_\_\_\_\_  
6 GEORGE FOLEY, JR.  
7 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28